

Message

---

**From:** Kirby-Miles, Leslie [Kirby-Miles.Leslie@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 2/6/2017 9:11:14 PM  
**To:** Stillman, Sarah [Stillman.Sarah@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: USG Redwing

Yes and I apologize for misspelling your first name! Thanks.

---

**From:** Stillman, Sarah  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 11:46 AM  
**To:** Kirby-Miles, Leslie <Kirby-Miles.Leslie@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: USG Redwing

Yes I do! Is your schedule up to date?

---

**From:** Kirby-Miles, Leslie  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 11:43 AM  
**To:** Stillman, Sarah <Stillman.Sarah@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: USG Redwing

Hi Sara,  
Are you taking my USG matter? If so, lets find some time to discuss. Thanks!

---

**From:** Schaufelberger, Daniel  
**Sent:** Friday, February 03, 2017 10:14 AM  
**To:** Robinson, Randall <robinson.randall@epa.gov>; Kirby-Miles, Leslie <Kirby-Miles.Leslie@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Summerhays, John <Summerhays.John@epa.gov>; Blakley, Pamela <blakley.pamela@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: USG Redwing

Thanks for the update Randy.

Daniel Schaufelberger  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5  
77 West Jackson Blvd. (AE-17J)  
Chicago, IL 60604-3590  
Phone: (312) 886-6814

---

**From:** Robinson, Randall  
**Sent:** Friday, February 03, 2017 10:11 AM  
**To:** Kirby-Miles, Leslie <Kirby-Miles.Leslie@epa.gov>; Schaufelberger, Daniel <schaufelberger.daniel@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Summerhays, John <Summerhays.John@epa.gov>; Blakley, Pamela <blakley.pamela@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** USG Redwing

Hello

Just FYI. I received a call from Jeff Bennet (Barr Engineering) on Wednesday. Jeff was the consultant modeler at our meeting a few weeks ago. He called to discuss meteorology options for use in their modeling. If you recall, Region used Minneapolis Airport met data, as did Minnesota PCA. Barr used a station located just across the river from the USG facility, however, that station has a lot of missing data. They substituted it with

computer generated met data but didn't have any information on the quality of that data. We had concerns about that.

Jeff feels the local data is the best option but mentioned they still don't have any QA or model performance information on what they submitted and it may be tough to acquire. I said while none of the met data options are perfect, we were still comfortable with Minneapolis, given the uncertainty of the other options and the favorable comparability of the wind roses for Minneapolis and the local data. It's quite likely there won't be much difference in terms of modeled concentrations between the two data sets. Both showed peaks in the same general areas.

Jeff did mention it's likely any modeling they do will consider both options. He thought they may have something to share in the spring time frame.

Randy